

1 BENJAMIN C. MIZER  
Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General  
2 JONATHAN F. OLIN  
Deputy Assistant Attorney General  
3 MICHAEL S. BLUME  
Director  
4 JILL FURMAN  
Deputy Director  
5

6 CLINT NARVER  
Trial Attorney  
7 Consumer Protection Branch  
U.S. Department of Justice  
8 450 Fifth Street, NW, Suite 6400 South  
Washington, DC 20530  
9 Tel. (202) 598-8056  
Fax: (202) 514-8742  
10 Clint.L.Narver@usdoj.gov

11 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
12 **FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

13 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
14

15 Plaintiff,

16 v.

17 VIVACEUTICALS, INC., d/b/a REGENECA  
WORLDWIDE, a corporation, and  
18 MATTHEW A. NICOSIA, an individual,

19 Defendants.  
20  
21

Case No.: 8:15-cv-1893

**COMPLAINT FOR  
PERMANENT  
INJUNCTION**

22  
23 Plaintiff, the United States of America, by its undersigned counsel, and on  
24 behalf of the United States Food and Drug Administration ("FDA"), respectfully  
25 represents to this Court as follows:

26 1. This statutory injunction proceeding is brought under the Federal  
27 Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (the "Act"), 21 U.S.C. § 332(a), and the inherent  
28

1 equitable authority of this Court, to permanently enjoin VivaCeuticals, Inc., doing  
2 business as Regeneca Worldwide, a corporation, and Matthew A. Nicosia, an  
3 individual (collectively, “Defendants”) from:

4           A.     Violating 21 U.S.C. § 331(a), by introducing or delivering for  
5 introduction, or causing to be introduced or delivered for introduction, into  
6 interstate commerce articles of food (dietary supplements) that are adulterated  
7 within the meaning of 21 U.S.C. § 342(g)(1) and/or U.S.C. § 342(a)(2)(C)(i);

8           B.     Violating 21 U.S.C. § 331(a) by introducing or delivering for  
9 introduction, or causing to be introduced or delivered for introduction, into  
10 interstate commerce articles of food (dietary supplements) that are misbranded  
11 within the meaning of 21 U.S.C. § 343(a)(1);

12           C.     Violating 21 U.S.C. § 331(k), by causing articles of food  
13 (dietary supplements) that are held for sale after shipment of one or more of their  
14 components in interstate commerce to become adulterated within the meaning of  
15 21 U.S.C. § 342(g)(1) and/or U.S.C. § 342(a)(2)(C)(i);

16           D.     Violating 21 U.S.C. § 331(k), by causing articles of food  
17 (dietary supplements) that are held for sale after shipment of one or more of their  
18 components in interstate commerce to become misbranded within the meaning of  
19 21 U.S.C. § 343(a)(1);

20           E.     Violating 21 U.S.C. § 331(d) by introducing or delivering for  
21 introduction, or causing to be introduced or delivered for introduction, into  
22 interstate commerce a new drug, as defined by 21 U.S.C. § 321(p), that is neither  
23 approved pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 355(a) nor exempt from approval pursuant to 21  
24 U.S.C. § 355(i); and

25           F.     Violating 21 U.S.C. § 331(k) by causing an article of drug that  
26 is held for sale after shipment of one or more of its components in interstate  
27 commerce to become misbranded within the meaning of 21 U.S.C. § 352(f)(1).  
28

1           2.     This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter and all parties to  
2 this action under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1337, and 1345, and 21 U.S.C. § 332(a).

3           3.     Venue in this district is proper under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and (c).

4                                 **Defendants**

5           4.     Defendant VivaCeuticals, Inc., doing business as Regeneca  
6 Worldwide, (“VivaCeuticals”) is incorporated under the laws of the state of  
7 Nevada. VivaCeuticals manufactures and distributes dietary supplements and  
8 drugs. VivaCeuticals does business at 2 Park Plaza, Suite 1200, Irvine, California  
9 92614, and 16 Technology Drive, Suite 124, Irvine, California 92618,  
10 (collectively, the “Facility”), within the jurisdiction of this Court.

11           5.     Defendant Matthew A. Nicosia is the Chief Executive Officer of  
12 VivaCeuticals. Mr. Nicosia is the most responsible person at the firm. He has  
13 ultimate authority over all of the firm’s operations, including major financial  
14 expenditures, product formulation, product release for distribution, product  
15 recalls, and the content of the firm’s labeling and websites, including  
16 [www.regeneca.com](http://www.regeneca.com), [www.regeneca.net](http://www.regeneca.net), [www.regeneslim.com](http://www.regeneslim.com), and  
17 [www.tryslimnow.com](http://www.tryslimnow.com). Defendant Nicosia performs his duties at 2 Park Plaza,  
18 Suite 1200, Irvine, California 92614, within the jurisdiction of this Court.

19           6.     Defendants have been and are now engaged in the business of  
20 manufacturing and distributing:

21                 A.     Dietary supplements within the meaning of the Act, which  
22 defines “dietary supplement” as “a product (other than tobacco) intended to  
23 supplement the diet” that contains one or more of the following dietary  
24 ingredients: a vitamin; a mineral; an herb or other botanical; an amino acid; a  
25 dietary substance for use by man to supplement the diet by increasing the total  
26 dietary intake; or a concentrate, metabolite, constituent, extract or combination of  
27 any of them, and that “is labeled as a dietary supplement” and “is not represented  
28 for use as a conventional food or as a sole item of a meal or the diet.” 21 U.S.C.

1 § 321(ff). (Except for purposes of 21 U.S.C. §§ 321(g) and 350f, dietary  
2 supplements are deemed to be food under the Act. 21 U.S.C. § 321(ff)); and

3 B. A product that meets the definition of drug under the Act, 21  
4 U.S.C. § 321(g)(1), in that its labeling contains claims that establish that the  
5 product is intended to cure, mitigate, treat, and/or prevent disease.

6 7. Defendants' products are manufactured using components shipped to  
7 California from locations outside the state, including China. Defendants distribute  
8 their products to customers in locations outside the state of California, including  
9 Florida, Iowa, and Nevada.

10 **Defendants' Violations of the Act**

11 **Adulterated Dietary Supplements**

12 8. The Act deems a dietary supplement to be adulterated if it is not  
13 prepared, packed, and held in conformance with current good manufacturing  
14 practice for dietary supplements ("Dietary Supplement CGMP"). 21 U.S.C.  
15 § 342(g)(1). Manufacturing according to Dietary Supplement CGMP means that  
16 the manufacturing process incorporates a set of controls in the design and  
17 production processes to assure a finished product of acceptable, predictable, and  
18 reliable quality. The Dietary Supplement CGMP regulations are set forth at 21  
19 C.F.R. Part 111.

20 9. FDA inspected Defendants' Facility on July 24, August 1, 6, and 21,  
21 and September 3, 2014 ("2014 inspection"). That inspection established that the  
22 dietary supplements Defendants manufacture and distribute are adulterated within  
23 the meaning of 21 U.S.C. § 342(g)(1) in that they are prepared, packed, or held in  
24 a manner that does not conform to Dietary Supplement CGMP regulations.  
25 During the 2014 inspection, an FDA investigator documented significant  
26 deviations from Dietary Supplement CGMP regulations, which include, but are  
27 not limited to, the following:  
28

1           A.     Failure to establish for each component an identity specification  
2 and other specifications necessary to ensure that the finished batch of dietary  
3 supplements manufactured using the component meets its specifications for  
4 purity, strength and composition, as required by 21 C.F.R. § 111.70(b);

5           B.     Failure to establish product specifications for the identity,  
6 purity, strength, and composition of, and limits on the types of contamination that  
7 may adulterate or may lead to adulteration of, the finished batch of dietary  
8 supplements, as required by 21 C.F.R. § 111.70(e);

9           C.     Failure to conduct at least one appropriate test or examination  
10 to verify the identity of every component that is a dietary ingredient before such  
11 component is used in the manufacture of a dietary supplement, as required by 21  
12 C.F.R. § 111.75(a)(1)(i);

13           D.     Failure to determine whether component specifications that  
14 must be established in accordance with 21 C.F.R. § 111.70(b) are met before such  
15 component is used in the manufacture of a dietary supplement, as required by 21  
16 C.F.R. § 111.75(a)(2);

17           E.     Failure to prepare and follow a complete written master  
18 manufacturing record for each unique formulation of dietary supplement, and for  
19 each batch size, to ensure uniformity in the finished product from batch to batch,  
20 as required by 21 C.F.R. § 111.205;

21           F.     Failure to prepare a batch production record each time a batch  
22 of dietary supplements is manufactured, as required by 21 C.F.R. § 111.255;

23           G.     Failure to establish and follow written procedures for the  
24 responsibilities of the quality control operations set forth in 21 C.F.R. § 111.105,  
25 as required by 21 C.F.R. § 111.103;

26           H.     Failure to establish and follow written procedures for holding  
27 and distributing operations, as required by 21 C.F.R. § 111.453, and make and  
28

1 keep written procedures for holding and distributing operations, and records of  
2 product distribution, as required by 21 C.F.R. § 111.475(b);

3 I. Failure to establish and follow written procedures for returned  
4 dietary supplements, as required by 21 C.F.R. § 111.503; and

5 J. Failure to establish and follow written procedures for the  
6 review and investigation of product complaints, as required by 21 CFR § 111.553.

7 10. During the 2014 inspection, an FDA investigator visited Defendants'  
8 warehouse located at 16 Technology Drive, Suite 124, Irvine, California, and  
9 collected samples of RegeneSlim (Lots EX0716R17414 and 11414RE5516).  
10 FDA analyzed the samples and detected 1, 3-dimethylamylamine (DMAA) in  
11 both product lots.

12 11. During an investigation on August 5, 2014, at Defendants' contract  
13 packager, an FDA investigator collected samples of RegeneSlim (Lots 823230415  
14 and EX0616R15813). FDA analyzed the samples and detected DMAA in both  
15 product lots.

16 12. In May 2014, FDA made an undercover purchase of RegeneSlim (Lot  
17 EX0616R15814) from one of Defendants' websites, [www.tryslimnow.com](http://www.tryslimnow.com).  
18 FDA's analysis detected the presence of DMAA in this product lot.

19 13. Because RegeneSlim contains DMAA or its chemical equivalents  
20 (collectively referred to as DMAA), the product is adulterated within the meaning  
21 of 21 U.S.C. § 342(a)(2)(C)(i) in that it contains a food additive that is unsafe  
22 within the meaning of 21 U.S.C. § 348(a).

23  
24 14. Under 21 U.S.C. § 321(s), a food additive is:

25 any substance the intended use of which results or may  
26 reasonably be expected to result, directly or indirectly, in its  
27 becoming a component ... of any food ... if such substance is  
28 not generally recognized, among experts qualified by scientific

1 training and experience to evaluate its safety, as having been  
 2 adequately shown through scientific procedures (or, in the case  
 3 of a substance used in food prior to January 1, 1958, through  
 4 either scientific procedures or experience based on common use  
 5 in food) to be safe under the conditions of its intended use;  
 6 except that such term does not include—

7 (1) a pesticide chemical residue in or on a raw agricultural  
 8 commodity or processed food; or

9 (2) a pesticide chemical; or

10 (3) a color additive; or

11 (4) any substance used in accordance with a sanction or  
 12 approval granted prior to [September 6, 1958] pursuant to this  
 13 Act, the Poultry Products Inspection Act ... or the Meat  
 14 Inspection Act ...; or

15 (5) a new animal drug; or

16 (6) an ingredient described in [21 U.S.C. § 321(ff)] in, or  
 17 intended for use in, a dietary supplement.

18 Thus, if a substance that is added to food is not generally recognized as safe, it  
 19 meets the food additive definition unless it falls within one of the exceptions set  
 20 forth in 21 U.S.C. § 321(s)(1)-(6).

21 15. FDA’s regulations state that “[g]eneral recognition of safety requires  
 22 common knowledge about the substance throughout the scientific community  
 23 knowledgeable about the safety of substances directly or indirectly added to  
 24 food,” and may be based on “scientific procedures” or, “in the case of a substance  
 25 used in food prior to January 1, 1958, through experience based on common use in  
 26 food.” 21 C.F.R. § 170.30(a).

27 A. General recognition of safety based on scientific procedures  
 28 “require[s] the same quantity and quality of scientific evidence as is required to

1 obtain approval of a food additive regulation for the ingredient” and “shall  
 2 ordinarily be based upon published studies which may be corroborated by  
 3 unpublished studies and other data and information.” 21 C.F.R. § 170.30(b).

4 B. General recognition of safety through experience based on  
 5 common use in food prior to January 1, 1958, may be determined without the  
 6 quantity or quality of scientific procedures required for approval of a food additive  
 7 regulation but “shall be based solely on food use of the substance prior to January  
 8 1, 1958, and shall ordinarily be based upon generally available data and  
 9 information.” 21 C.F.R. § 170.30(c)(1).

10 C. “An ingredient not in common use in food prior to January 1,  
 11 1958, may achieve general recognition of safety *only* through scientific  
 12 procedures.” 21 C.F.R. § 170.30(c)(1) (emphasis added).

13 16. FDA is not aware of any evidence to show that DMAA was used in  
 14 food prior to 1958. Therefore, DMAA may achieve general recognition of safety  
 15 only through scientific procedures. *See* 21 C.F.R. § 170.30(c)(1).

16 17. There are no adequate studies in the published scientific literature to  
 17 show that DMAA is safe for use in food. Therefore, qualified experts cannot  
 18 come to a consensus of opinion concerning DMAA’s safe use in food and, thus,  
 19 DMAA is not generally recognized as safe under the conditions of its intended  
 20 use.

21 18. DMAA does not fall within any exception from the food additive  
 22 definition. *See* 21 U.S.C. § 321(s)(1)-(6). Therefore, DMAA is a food additive.

23  
 24 19. Under 21 U.S.C. § 348(a):

25 A food additive shall, with respect to any particular use or  
 26 intended use of such additives, be deemed to be unsafe for the  
 27 purposes of the application of [21 U.S.C. § 342(a)(2)(C)],  
 28 unless—



(1) it and its use or intended use conform to the terms of an exemption [for investigational use] which is in effect pursuant to [21 U.S.C. § 348(j)]; [or]  
(2) there is in effect, and it and its use or intended use are in conformity with, a regulation issued under this section prescribing the conditions under which such additive may be safely used[.]

20. DMAA is not the subject of a regulation prescribing the conditions under which it may be safely used or an exemption for investigational use. Therefore, DMAA is a food additive that is deemed unsafe under 21 U.S.C. § 348(a).

21. Defendants violate 21 U.S.C. § 331(a) by introducing or delivering for introduction, or causing to be introduced or delivered for introduction, into interstate commerce articles of food (dietary supplements) that are adulterated within the meaning of 21 U.S.C. § 342(g)(1) in that they have been prepared, packed, or held under conditions that do not meet Dietary Supplement CGMP regulations, 21 C.F.R. Part 111.

22. Defendants violate 21 U.S.C. § 331(a) by introducing or delivering for introduction, or causing to be introduced or delivered for introduction, into interstate commerce articles of food (dietary supplements) that are adulterated within the meaning of 21 U.S.C. § 342(a)(2)(C)(i) in that they contain a food additive that is unsafe within the meaning of 21 U.S.C. § 348(a).

23. Defendants violate 21 U.S.C. § 331(k) by causing articles of food (dietary supplements) that are held for sale after shipment of one or more of their components in interstate commerce to become adulterated within the meaning of 21 U.S.C. § 342(g)(1).

24. Defendants violate 21 U.S.C. § 331(k) by causing articles of food (dietary supplements) that are held for sale after shipment of one or more of their

1 components in interstate commerce to become adulterated within the meaning of  
2 21 U.S.C. § 342(a)(2)(C)(i).

3 *Misbranded Dietary Supplements*

4 25. A food is misbranded if its “labeling is false or misleading in any  
5 particular.” 21 U.S.C. § 343(a)(1). The Act provides that, “in determining  
6 whether the labeling . . . is misleading there shall be taken into account . . . not  
7 only representations made or suggested . . . but also the extent to which the  
8 labeling . . . fails to reveal facts material in the light of such representations or  
9 material with respect to consequences which may result from the use of the article  
10 to which the labeling . . . relates under the conditions of use prescribed in the  
11 labeling.” 21 U.S.C. § 321(n).

12 26. As noted in paragraphs 10-12 above, analytical testing of RegeneSlim  
13 detected DMAA in the product.

14 27. DMAA has the potential to pose serious adverse health risks in that it  
15 may elevate blood pressure which, in turn, may stress the heart, causing shortness  
16 of breath, tightening of the chest, and possibly a heart attack.

17 28. The labeling for RegeneSlim is false or misleading because it does not  
18 declare that it contains DMAA or reveal the consequences that may result from  
19 using a product containing this ingredient. Therefore, RegeneSlim is misbranded  
20 within the meaning of 21 U.S.C. § 343(a)(1).

21 29. Defendants violate 21 U.S.C. § 331(a) by introducing or delivering for  
22 introduction, or causing to be introduced or delivered for introduction, into  
23 interstate commerce articles of food (dietary supplements) that are misbranded  
24 within the meaning of 21 U.S.C. § 343(a)(1).

25 30. Defendants violate 21 U.S.C. § 331(k), by causing articles of food  
26 (dietary supplements) that are held for sale after shipment of one or more of their  
27 components in interstate commerce to become misbranded within the meaning of  
28 21 U.S.C. § 343(a)(1);

Unapproved New Drugs

31. The Act's definition of drug includes products that are intended for use in the diagnosis, cure, mitigation, treatment, or prevention of disease.

21 U.S.C. § 321(g)(1)(B).

32. A drug that is a "new drug" within the meaning of the Act is prohibited from being introduced or delivered for introduction into interstate commerce unless FDA has approved a new drug application or abbreviated new drug application for that drug, or the drug is exempt from approval under an investigational new drug application. *See* 21 U.S.C. §§ 355(a), (b), (i), and (j).

33. Because a product's intended use determines whether it is a drug under the Act, a product that falls within the Act's dietary supplement definition may also meet the Act's drug definition if it is intended for use in the diagnosis, cure, mitigation, treatment, or prevention of disease. *See* 21 U.S.C. § 321(ff).

34. Defendants cause their RegeneSlim product to be a drug under the Act because they make claims that the product is intended to cure, mitigate, treat, or prevent diseases ("disease claims").

35. FDA's review of Defendants' websites, [www.regeneslim.com](http://www.regeneslim.com) and [www.tryslimnow.com](http://www.tryslimnow.com), on April 21, 2015, documented that Defendants state that RegeneSlim contains ChromeMate®, which according their websites is a "unique patented form of oxygen-coordinated niacin-bound chromium found to be 18-times more bio-active than other forms of niacin-bound chromium that have been tested." Defendants' websites contained the following claims for the ingredient, ChromeMate®:

Clinical studies\*\* have shown that ChromeMate® lowers serum cholesterol and improves HDL (good) cholesterol levels, lowers blood pressure, reduces body weight, . . . and promotes proper insulin function in the body... It also increases insulin...

1 The claims, “lowers serum cholesterol,” “lowers blood pressure,” and “promotes  
2 proper insulin function...[and] increases insulin,” demonstrate that Defendants  
3 intend that the ChromeMate®-containing RegeneSlim cures, mitigates, treats, or  
4 prevents high cholesterol, high blood pressure, and diabetes, respectively.

5 36. A drug is a “new drug” if “the composition of which is such that such  
6 drug is not generally recognized, among experts qualified by scientific training  
7 and experience to evaluate the safety and effectiveness of drugs, as safe and  
8 effective for use under the conditions prescribed, recommended, or suggested in  
9 the labeling thereof.” 21 U.S.C. § 321(p)(1). For a product to be deemed  
10 “generally recognized as safe and effective” (“GRAS/E”), it must have substantial  
11 evidence of safety and effectiveness. *See* 21 U.S.C. § 355(d).

12 37. Defendants’ RegeneSlim lacks substantial evidence of safety and  
13 effectiveness. There are no published adequate and well-controlled investigations  
14 to show that RegeneSlim is effective for any use and, therefore, qualified experts  
15 cannot come to a consensus of opinion concerning the effectiveness of this  
16 product. Thus, RegeneSlim is not GRAS/E.

17 38. Because Defendants’ RegeneSlim is not GRAS/E, it is a new drug.

18 39. FDA searched its records and found no new drug application,  
19 abbreviated new drug application, or investigational new drug application for  
20 RegeneSlim. Therefore, RegeneSlim is an unapproved new drug within the  
21 meaning of the Act, 21 U.S.C. § 355(a).

22 40. Defendants violate 21 U.S.C. § 331(d) by introducing or delivering  
23 for introduction, or causing to be introduced or delivered for introduction, into  
24 interstate commerce a new drug, as defined by 21 U.S.C. § 321(p), that is neither  
25 approved pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 355(a) nor exempt from approval pursuant to 21  
26 U.S.C. § 355(i).

Misbranded Drugs

41. A drug is misbranded within the meaning of 21 U.S.C. § 352(f)(1) if its labeling fails to bear “adequate directions for use” and it does not fall within a regulatory exemption from that requirement. “Adequate directions for use” means “directions under which the layman can use a drug safely and for the purpose for which it is intended.” 21 C.F.R. § 201.5(a).

42. By definition, a drug that is also a prescription drug cannot have adequate instructions for lay use. 21 U.S.C. § 353 (b)(1)(A) (requiring a drug to be dispensed by prescription that, “because of its toxicity or other potentiality for harmful effect, or the method of its use, or the collateral measures necessary to its use, is not safe for use except under the supervision of a practitioner licensed by law to administer such drug”).

43. Drugs that are unapproved are not exempt from the requirement for adequate directions for use. *See* 21 C.F.R. §§ 201.100(c)(2), 201.115.

44. It is not possible to write adequate directions for use for Defendants’ RegeneSlim because such directions -- including dosages, indications, contraindications, warnings, side effects, and necessary collateral measures -- are premised on animal and clinical data derived from extensive, scientifically controlled testing and reviewed by FDA during the approval process. As noted in paragraph 37 above, there are no well-controlled clinical test data for RegeneSlim.

45. In addition, because of the purposes for which it is intended and/or the potential for serious adverse effects, RegeneSlim is a prescription drug, which, as a matter of law, cannot meet the requirement for “adequate directions for use.” *See* U.S.C. § 352(f)(1); 21 C.F.R. § 201.5(a).

46. Defendants’ RegeneSlim is misbranded within the meaning of 21 U.S.C. § 352(f)(1) because its labeling fails to bear adequate directions for use.

1           47. Defendants violate 21 U.S.C. § 331(k) by causing articles of drug that  
2 Defendants hold for sale after shipment in interstate commerce to become  
3 misbranded within the meaning of 21 U.S.C. § 352(f)(1).

4                           **Warnings and Previous Violations**

5           48. Defendants have been warned about their ongoing violations. At the  
6 close of the 2014 inspection, an FDA investigator issued a List of Inspectional  
7 Observations (“Form FDA-483”) to Defendant Nicosia, and discussed each of the  
8 observed Dietary Supplement CGMP deviations with him. The FDA investigator  
9 also informed Defendant Nicosia about the laboratory analyses that detected an  
10 undeclared substance, namely DMAA, in multiple lots of RegeneSlim (Lots  
11 EX0716R17414, 11414RE5516, 823230415, EX0616R15813, and  
12 EX0616R15814), and that DMAA cannot be used as an ingredient in dietary  
13 supplements.

14           49. Defendants received a Warning Letter, dated August 28, 2012, from  
15 FDA notifying them that the use of DMAA in RegeneSlim causes the product to  
16 be adulterated. The 2012 Warning Letter cautioned Defendants about the  
17 potential health hazards associated with DMAA, and emphasized that Defendants’  
18 failure to immediately cease distribution of RegeneSlim and any other products  
19 that contain DMAA could result in enforcement actions, such as injunction.

20           50. Defendants have a history of adding undeclared substances, including  
21 as active pharmaceutical ingredients, to products they market as dietary  
22 supplements. During an inspection in February 2012, an FDA investigator  
23 informed Defendants that the agency’s laboratory analysis of Defendants’  
24 RegenArouse product (Lot 130100) revealed the presence of tadalafil, the active  
25 ingredient in Cialis. In addition, FDA’s laboratory analyses of samples collected  
26 during the 2012 inspection confirmed that multiple lots of RegenErect (Lots  
27 120126, 120128, 120129) also contained tadalafil.

1           51. FDA previously warned Defendants about the use of undeclared  
2 active pharmaceutical ingredients in their products and labeling claims that cause  
3 their products to meet the Act's drug definition. FDA issued a Warning Letter,  
4 dated May 25, 2011, to Defendants that stated: FDA's analyses identified  
5 sulfoildenafilafil (an analog of sildenafil, the active ingredient in Viagra) in multiple  
6 lots of RegenErect; Defendants' claims cause RegenErect to be a drug within the  
7 meaning of the Act because the product is intended to cure, treat, or prevent  
8 diseases and/or affect the structure or function of the body; and, the product is a  
9 misbranded and an unapproved new drug. The 2011 Warning Letter emphasized  
10 the serious nature of the violations and advised Defendants that RegenErect could  
11 cause harm to consumers. As described in the letter, Defendants were warned that  
12 they may be subject to legal action, including an injunction, for failure to take  
13 prompt action to correct the violations.

14           52. Defendants have promised corrective actions, but they have  
15 consistently failed to achieve compliance with the law. Following the 2014  
16 inspection, Defendant Nicosia submitted a written response, dated September 20,  
17 2014, but failed to adequately address several significant Dietary Supplement  
18 CGMP deficiencies documented on the Form FDA-483. In response to FDA's  
19 Warning Letters issued in 2011 and 2012, Defendant Nicosia made additional  
20 promises and stated that Defendants would no longer distribute products that  
21 contained PDE-5 inhibitors (e.g., active pharmaceutical ingredients in Viagra,  
22 Cialis, and Levitra) or DMAA. Despite their promises, however, Defendants  
23 subsequently distributed products that contained PDE-5 inhibitors or DMAA, as  
24 confirmed by FDA's laboratory analyses.

25           53. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff believes that, unless restrained by  
26 this Court, Defendants will continue to violate the Act in the manner set forth  
27 above. WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court:  
28



1           I.     Order that Defendants, and each and all of their directors, officers,  
2 agents, representatives, employees, attorneys, successors, and assigns, and any  
3 and all persons in active concert or participation with any of them, cease  
4 receiving, manufacturing, preparing, packing, repacking, labeling, holding, or  
5 distributing articles of dietary supplement and/or articles of drug, unless and until:

6           A.     Defendants' facilities, methods, processes, and controls used to  
7 receive, manufacture, prepare, pack, repack, label, hold, and distribute dietary  
8 supplements are established, operated, and administered in conformity with  
9 Dietary Supplement CGMP and the Act, in a manner that has been found  
10 acceptable to FDA;

11           B.     Defendants have methods, processes, and controls that are  
12 adequate to ensure that none of the dietary supplements that Defendants receive,  
13 manufacture, prepare, pack, repack, label, hold, or distribute contain a food  
14 additive that is unsafe within the meaning of 21 U.S.C. § 348(a), in a manner that  
15 has been found acceptable to FDA;

16           C.     Defendants' dietary supplement labeling complies with 21  
17 U.S.C. § 343(a)(1) and applicable regulations, in a manner acceptable to FDA;  
18 and

19           D.     Defendants' labeling does not contain claims that cause any  
20 dietary supplement that Defendants manufacture, prepare, pack, label, hold, or  
21 distribute to meet the Act's definition of a drug, 21 U.S.C. § 321(g)(1)(B), unless  
22 and until the product is the subject of an approved new drug application or  
23 abbreviated new drug application, or is exempt from approval under an  
24 investigational new drug application, 21 U.S.C. §§ 355(a), (b), (i), and (j).

25           II.    Order that Defendants, and each and all of their directors, officers,  
26 agents, representatives, employees, attorneys, successors, and assigns, and any  
27 and all persons in active concert or participation with any of them, be permanently  
28



1 restrained and enjoined under 21 U.S.C. § 332(a) from directly or indirectly doing  
2 or causing to be done any of the following acts:

3 A. Violating 21 U.S.C. § 331(a), by introducing or delivering for  
4 introduction, or causing to be introduced or delivered for introduction, into  
5 interstate commerce articles of food (including but not limited to dietary  
6 supplements and their components) that are adulterated within the meaning of 21  
7 U.S.C. § 342(g)(1);

8 B. Violating 21 U.S.C. § 331(a) by introducing or delivering for  
9 introduction, or causing to be introduced or delivered for introduction, into  
10 interstate commerce articles of food (including but not limited to dietary  
11 supplements and their components) that are adulterated within the meaning of  
12 U.S.C. § 342(a)(2)(C)(i);

13 C. Violating 21 U.S.C. § 331(a), by introducing or delivering for  
14 introduction, or causing to be introduced or delivered for introduction, into  
15 interstate commerce articles of food (including but not limited to dietary  
16 supplements and their components) that are misbranded within the meaning of 21  
17 U.S.C. § 343(a)(1);

18 D. Violating 21 U.S.C. § 331(k) by causing articles of food  
19 (including but not limited to dietary supplements and their components) that are  
20 held for sale after shipment of one or more components in interstate commerce to  
21 become adulterated within the meaning of 21 U.S.C. § 342(g)(1);

22 E. Violating 21 U.S.C. § 331(k) by causing articles of food  
23 (including but not limited to dietary supplements and their components) that are  
24 held for sale after shipment of one or more components in interstate commerce to  
25 become adulterated within the meaning of U.S.C. § 342(a)(2)(C)(i);

26 F. Violating 21 U.S.C. § 331(k) by causing articles of food  
27 (including but not limited to dietary supplements and their components) that are  
28

1 held for sale after shipment of one or more components in interstate commerce to  
2 become misbranded within the meaning of U.S.C. § 343(a)(1);

3 G. Violating 21 U.S.C. § 331(d) by introducing or delivering for  
4 introduction, or causing to be introduced or delivered for introduction, into  
5 interstate commerce new drugs, as defined by 21 U.S.C. § 321(p), that are neither  
6 approved pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 355(a) nor exempt from approval pursuant to 21  
7 U.S.C. § 355(i); and

8 H. Violating 21 U.S.C. § 331(k) by causing articles of drug held  
9 for sale after shipment of one or more components in interstate commerce to  
10 become misbranded within the meaning of 21 U.S.C. § 352(f)(1); and

11 III. Order that FDA be authorized pursuant to this injunction to inspect  
12 Defendants' place(s) of business and all records relating to the receipt,  
13 manufacture, preparing, packing, labeling, holding, and distribution of all of  
14 Defendants' products to ensure continuing compliance with the terms of the  
15 injunction, the costs of such inspections to be borne by Defendants at the rates  
16 prevailing at the time the inspections are accomplished; and

17 IV. Order that Plaintiff be awarded costs incurred in pursuing this action,  
18 including the costs of investigation to date, and such other equitable relief as the  
19 Court deems just and proper.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 DATED this 16th day of November, 2015.

2  
3  
4 Respectfully submitted,  
5 BENJAMIN C. MIZER  
6 Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney  
7 General  
8 JONATHAN F. OLIN  
9 Deputy Assistant Attorney General  
10 MICHAEL S. BLUME  
11 Director  
12 JILL FURMAN  
13 Deputy Director

14 By: /s/ Clint Narver  
15 Clint Narver  
16 Trial Attorney  
17 Consumer Protection Branch  
18 Department of Justice, Civil Division  
19 P.O. Box 386  
20 Washington, D.C. 20044  
(202) 598-8056  
Clint.L.Narver@USDOJ.gov

21 OF COUNSEL:

22 WILLIAM B. SCHULTZ  
23 General Counsel

24 ELIZABETH H. DICKINSON  
25 Chief Counsel  
26 Food and Drug Division

27 ANNAMARIE KEMPIC  
28

1 Deputy Chief Counsel for Litigation

2 CLAUDIA J. ZUCKERMAN

3 Senior Counsel

4 Office of the Chief Counsel

5 Food and Drug Administration

6 10903 New Hampshire Avenue

7 Bldg. 31, Room 4550

8 Silver Spring, MD 20993-0002

9 301-796-8609